DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 276 696 SP 028 278

AUTHOR Clarke, Carolyn; Richardson, Joe A.
TITLE Peer Clinical Supervision: A Collegial Approach.
PUB DATE [86]
NOTE 36p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Council of States on Inservice Education (11th, Nashville, TN, November 21-25, 1986).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Environment; Elementary Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Peer Evaluation; *Program Effectiveness; *Staff Development; Teacher Administrator Relationship; *Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS *Clinical Supervision

ABSTRACT

This study analyzed the potential of peer clinical supervision as an effective approach to the supervision of teachers and examined the many variables that affect the model's effectiveness. Eleven volunteer elementary school teachers participated in three training sessions designed to explore the conceptual nature of clinical supervision and to train the participants in clinical supervision techniques. Each participant completed three cycles of clinical supervision. Questionnaires, interviews, audiotapes, and field notes were used to report the study's findings. Peer clinical supervision fared best in schools typified by positive collegial relations, sustained faculty interactions, leadership that supported the process, and a sense of professional initiative. The study concluded that peer supervision can make a contribution, but only after recognizing the numerous variables bearing directly on the success of the effort. Appendices present examples of seating charts, a time chart, pre-observation agreement form, questionnaire, and interview forms. (Author/CB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED276696

Peer Clinical Supervision: A Collegial Approach

Carolyn Clarke
Principal
Mountain Park Elementary
Atlanta, Georgia

Joe Richardson
Professor
Executive Director
Principals' Institute
Georgia State University
Atlanta, Georgia

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Richardson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP 028 278

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to analyze the potential of peer clinical supervision as an effective approach to the supervision of teachers and to examine the many variables that impact on the success of the model.

Eleven volunteer elementary teachers participated in three training sessions designed to explore the conceptual nature of clinical supervision and to train the participants in clinical supervision techniques. Each participant completed three cycles of clinical supervision. Questionnaires, interviews, audio-tapes and field notes were used to report the findings of this study.

Peer clinical supervision fares best in schools typified by positive colleague relations, sustained faculty interactions, leadership that supports the process, and a sense of professional initiative. Peer supervision can make a contribution, but only after recognizing the numerous variables bearing directly on the success of the effort.

Peer Clinical Supervision:
A Collegial Approach

With fewer teachers entering the profession and fewer leaving each year, schools are faced with the prospect of a relatively stable, tenured faculty. It has become mandatory to find ways to foster the on-going professional development of new as well as seasoned teachers (McFaul, 1984). Research suggests that descriptive feedback generated in the context of a collegial relationship may be the most effective means of assisting teachers in improving themselves and understanding teaching behaviors (Goldhammer, 1969; Goldsberry, 1980). It is simply impossible for those who carry the formal title of supervisor to have any direct impact on large numbers of teachers. If supervision is to be improved, its base must be broadened.

Peer supervision is seen as a way of expanding the person power and expertise available for supervision and, also, a way for ensuring that teachers have both the autonomy and responsibility necessary to increase their effectiveness in the classroom (Darling-Hammond, 1985). A program that develops the collaborative problem solving efforts of teachers in a trusting environment is needed so that teachers might collect and use descriptive feedback on topics of their concern to improve their teaching performance (McFaul, 1984). The "clinical supervision" model, developed by Goldhammer (1969) and Cogan (1973) seems suited for such an approach. Teachers trained in clinical

supervision methods and brought together in a collegial atmosphere, could serve as "peer supervisors" to collect data and use that data as a basis to improve instruction (McFaul, 1984).

A case study of peer clinical supervision was conducted at Mountain Park Elementary School, Fulton County, Georgia. The study attempted to look at the many variables that impact on the effectiveness of a peer clinical supervision program. Variables such as organizational climate, implementation procedures, colleague interactions, and analytical skills of participants were explored. The major question: Is peer clinical supervision an effective approach to the supervision of teachers?

DESIGN

Setting

Mountain Park Elementary School is a suburban elementary school in the outskirts of Atlanta, Georgia, serving approximately five hundred students, kindergarten through fifth grade. Ninety-nine percent of the school population is white and one percent black. Only three students receive free lunch tickets with most students coming from high socio-economic residential neighborhoods.

The architectural design of the building appears to have an influence on the amount of teacher interaction that takes place. The school consists of an L-shaped configuration with self-contained classrooms in two wings. This design promotes teacher isolation with some teachers not seeing other teachers

for days or weeks at a time.

There is evidence of an attempt to promote teacher interaction: teachers eat lunch in the teacher's lounge twice a week; teachers gather in the teacher's lounge each morning for coffee; and monthly grade level meetings are held.

During the previous year, the principal observed in each classroom at least three times holding a pre and post-conference with each observation. Based on the results of these observations, the principal and the teacher decided if the teacher should continue in the highly structured model of clinical supervision with the principal or be offered a variety of supervisory modes designed to enhance the growth of the strong, experienced teacher. Peer supervision was among several models offered to teachers attempting to find professional growth.

Participants

From a staff of twenty-five teachers, six were non-tenured while nineteen were tenured. In the latter group, two were new to the school. In the previous year's teacher performance evaluation, one tenured teacher was identified as deficit in one or more teaching competencies, and sixteen tenured teachers were identified as competent in all teaching competencies. The opportunity to participate in a peer clinical supervision program was offered to the sixteen competent tenured teachers. Eleven chose to participate in the project. Their teaching assignments ranged from kindergarten through fourth grade with one subject area specialist as shown in Table 1. Of the eleven participants,

ten were female; one was male. All eleven were white.

Table 1. Teaching Assignments

Grade Level	Number of Participants
Kindergarten	2
First	2
Second	3
Third	1
Fourth	3
Fifth	0
P.E. Specialist	1

Table 2 shows the mean number of years teaching as 11.5. Most of the participants were in the middle or later stages of their career.

Table 2. Years Teaching Experiences

Number of Years	Number of Teachers
5	1 } early career stage
6	1
8	1
9	1 } middle career stage
10	2
12	2
13	1
17	1 } later career stage
18	1
19	1

$\overline{X} = 11.5$

Table 3 shows that two-thirds of the teachers in the study have been at Mountain Park Elementary six years or more while Table 4 suggests a middle age group with a mean of 39.8.

Table 3. Years at Mountain Park

Number Previous Years at Mountain Park	Number of Participants
1	2
2	1
5	1
6	2
7	1
8	1
9	1
10	1
12	1
13	1

$\bar{X} = 6.6$

Table 4. Age

Participant's Age	Number of Participants
27	1
33	1
34	1
37	1
38	1
39	1
40	1
41	1
43	1
47	1
48	1
51	1

$\bar{X} = 39.8$

Training Program

In September, 1985, a general meeting was held for the entire faculty to inform them of the impending study. Topics such as the definition of peer clinical supervision, pros and

cons of peer clinical supervision, description of the clinical supervision model, the training program for the project, and the time commitments involved were covered in this session. Participation in the study was offered to the competent tenured teachers but on a voluntary basis. Eleven elected to participate.

In October, 1985, the first training session, conducted by the principal, was held for the eleven participants. Topics covered in this session were the selection of a partner and establishing criteria for observations. Sources such as the prior year's evaluation results, student questionnaires, and a self-assessment instrument were suggested as possible sources for criteria.

The second training session centered around working with a video tape on clinical supervision. The video tape gave helpful suggestions for successful pre and post conferences. Suggested techniques were given by the principal for data gathering such as script writing, time-off task seating chart, teacher interaction chart, and time usage chart (see Appendix A,B,C). Pre-observation agreement forms (see Appendix D) were also distributed at this session.

Data Collection and Analysis Procedures

Questionnaires (see Appendix E), interviews (see Appendix F), audio-tapes, and field notes enabled this researcher to report the findings of this study according to four data collection categories:

1.) Data from audio-tapes of each pre and post conference

were analyzed according to the focus of observation, instruments used, interactions between team members, and problem solving techniques used by the participants.

2.) Ethnographic fieldnotes were analyzed according to major themes such as the role of the principal, organizational atmosphere, and effectiveness of implementation procedures.

3.) Data from the structured interviews focused on the teacher's reaction to the peer clinical supervision process. Strengths, weaknesses, constraints, and plans of action were discussed.

4.) Demographic data was gathered from a questionnaire to help discover relationships between age, years of experience, choice of partner, etc.

Limitations of the Study

The investigator in this study was the principal promoting some apprehension by the participants that their conferences were being taped by the "boss." As principal, the researcher was so immersed in the project, it was often difficult to remain objective. Because this principal was so in hopes this program would be successful and provide a broader and richer supervisory base for an overburdened administrator, bias was definitely present.

The training program was limited due to time constraints imposed by the college course that required this project.

The case study format does not allow for generalizing the findings to other populations; however, it does provide more comparative data to be used with others who have conducted similar studies.

As the major "instrument" in this study was the researcher, this effort is limited by her abilities.

ANALYSIS

The findings of this study will be reported according to four data sources: Data collected from tape recordings of pre and post-observation conferences, the ethnographic field notes, the structured interview, and the initial questionnaire (analyzed in Design section).

Ethnographic Field Notes and Tape Recordings of Pre and Post-Observation Conferences

Focus of observation. Tape recordings for twenty-one of the twenty-five conferences were available for analysis. Four of the tapes were inaudible. Table 5 lists the foci according to three categories: on students, on teacher-pupil interactions, and on teacher. As teachers began the peer supervision process, most observation criteria selected focused on student behavior, but by the third observation, six teachers asked their observer to give them feedback on specific teaching skills.

Table 5. Focus for Observations

Focus	Frequency Over 3 Observations			
	1	2	3	Total
On Students	6	5	2	13
On Teacher-Pupil Interactions	1	2		3
On Teacher	1	1	6	8

Instruments. Teachers used a variety of techniques to collect data as noted in Table 6. Seating charts and note-taking procedures were most often used. Most techniques were discussed in the training sessions by the principal. Only three teachers devised their own data collection instrument.

Table 6. Instruments Used for Observations

Instruments	Frequency Over 3 Observations			
	1	2	3	Total
*Seating Chart	5	5	3	13
*Note Taking	2	3	5	10
*Interaction Tally Sheet	2	2		4
*Student Questionnaire	1			1
Observation Checklist	1			1
Matrix	1			1
Video Tape			1	1

*provided by principal

The instruments used by the teachers were adequate for the intended purpose. Each teacher carefully gathered a wealth of data, often providing more information than was requested.

Evidence of discussion regarding the focus of the observation and the instrument used to gather requested data was found in every tape-recorded pre-conference. The teacher being observed made the final decision regarding focus and instrumentation.

Teacher Interactions. The initial general tone of the conferences ranged from neutral and strained to warm and highly interactive. By the third conference, all teams had developed a rapport and sense of comraderie with each other as noted by increased openness and risk-taking incidents.

In all instances, the observer gave the requested data to the teacher. In most teams, the data were examined collaboratively between observer and teacher, while in a few teams, the observer analyzed the data without providing the teacher an opportunity for analysis. However, in the midst of all this elaborate feedback, only three observers gave specific suggestions for improvement, four teachers made plans for improvement, and only one team engaged in active and productive problem solving. Those instances of problem solving were identified as ones in which an issue was raised and discussed for a length of time during which alternative hypotheses or resolutions were shared (McFaul, 1982). The common approach was to provide requested data along with many positive comments but seldom solving

the identified problem.

Interview and Ethnographic Field Notes

Selection of criteria for observation. Participants relied almost solely on the suggestions given in the training sessions for criteria selection with only two teachers devising original criteria that had not been recommended by the principal in the training workshops. Over half of the participants indicated an insecurity in identifying criteria for observation.

Confidence in the team member's ability to assess the requested data accurately. The degree of confidence was directly related to the factors that determined the choice of partners as noted in Table 7. Team members that were assigned by the administrator indicated a lack of confidence in their own abilities and the abilities of their observer due mainly in differences in teaching experiences and teaching philosophies. Teams composed of teachers who chose their partners based on friendship, similar teaching background, similar philosophy of education, and similar skills in teaching indicated a confidence in their own abilities and the abilities of their observer.

Table 7. Significant Factors In Choosing A Partner

Factors	Number of Participants
Luck of the draw, only one person left	0
Random assignment	0
Assignment by an administrator	4
Friendship	6
Similar background or teaching experience	7
Seeking different background or teaching experience	0
Similar philosophy of education	7
Similar subject fields	8
Seeking different subject fields	2
Similar skills in teaching	7
Seeking different skills in teaching	3

Anxiety level. All participants indicated less anxiety level when being observed by a peer than by the principal because the peer was there only to give requested feedback while the principal was there to evaluate. Also, several teachers felt less anxiety being observed by a peer because they had been observed several times in the prior year by the principal. They were beginning to feel comfortable with someone else in their room.

Honesty with partners. Most participants felt they were

able to be open and honest but qualified that idea with such statements as "He was such a good teacher, I only had to give positive comments and that was easy." "No problems if I dealt strictly with the requested data and gave no judgemental feedback." "At first, I structured the data collection procedure for my observer so no judgements of my teaching skills would be discussed . I couldn't handle that." "When observing the students, very easy to be open, but when asked to observe her teaching skills, I found it difficult." and "I would have real difficulty being absolutely honest with a peer. Some teachers would get mad, but I suppose for this program to be successful, you must be able to be very honest." The only team that engaged in constructive criticism and active problem solving was a team that normally met as a grade level every week participating in these processes on a regular basis prior to the onset of this project.

Changes in teaching patterns. Only the three teachers in the team mentioned above made major changes in their teaching based on suggestions made by the observer. Two other teachers pursued some slight changes in their teaching due to this experience while six teachers indicated they had made no changes in their teaching based on their experiences in this project. All participants felt the experience helped reinforce their feeling that what they were doing was right, and several felt the process had made them more analytical of the teaching process.

Desire to continue peer supervision. All participants indicated a desire to continue peer supervision but noted a need for release time to observe. Although the principal was available to cover classes while the participants observed, few took advantage of that offer because of the difficulty of coordinating their observation schedule with the principal's schedule. Most used their break time when the students were with the physical education specialist or the music specialist.

Several mentioned an interest in continuing just to observe in other teacher's classrooms for the remainder of this year eliminating the time consuming pre and post-conferences.

All participants felt the program worked better in an intensive short time frame, rather than spreading the observations throughout the school year. During the three month time period of this project, communication flowed, and the momentum moved the process forward. The participants felt this would be lost if spread out over a long period of time.

All participants would like to be involved in peer clinical supervision next year.

Clinical supervision with a peer versus a supervisor. Eight teachers felt that a supervision program should consist of the traditional approach to clinical supervision using a supervisor in conjunction with feedback from peers. They enjoyed the comfortable supportive atmosphere created by peer supervision but felt a need for the objective and honest feedback that a supervisor could provide. Three teachers preferred clinical supervision with a peer

over the traditional clinical supervision model with a supervisor due not only to the increased apprehension from a supervisor's visit, but also because they felt the feedback from a peer was more helpful than from a supervisor.

Positive and negative aspects of peer clinical supervision. (Table 8 and Table 9). Several participants indicated the greatest strength of the program was developing a closer working relationship with a peer; developing a broader support system. Also, many felt more self-confident after this experience not only due to the supportive nature of their peer but from their own ability to help a fellow teacher.

The time commitments involved in this process and the lack of ample release time were the major weaknesses indentified. Two participants voiced a concern that the training sessions did not allow teachers an opportunity to explore alternatives available to them in pursuing this program.

Table 8. Positive Aspects of Peer Clinical Supervision

Aspects	Number of Participants
Develop a closer working relationship with a fellow teacher	4
Build self-confidence	4
Learn different teaching techniques	2
Improve communication skills	2
Enhance the ability to analyze teaching process	1

Table 9. Negative Aspects of Peer Clinical Supervision

Aspects	Number of Participants
Lack of release time	5
Time involved in process	5
Lack of adequate training	2
No negative aspects	4

INTERPRETATIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Peer clinical supervision seems to fare better in schools typified by positive colleague relations, sustained faculty interactions, leadership that supports the process, and a sense of professional initiative. At the outset of this project, this researcher felt confident that all of the necessary ingredients were present and pursued the project expecting peer clinical supervision to be an enormous success. What a surprise to find the delicate nature of peer supervision and to discover that several of the key elements necessary for success were not present in this school.

The Mountain Park Elementary faculty is extremely professional, constantly initiating new ideas and projects. Little bickering is present with each treating the other with the greatest respect. Of course, the principal supported the project as she designed and implemented the idea. However, something was missing, as the data shows, little willingness and/or ability to engage in open,

active problem solving was exhibited during this three month project.

Two areas seem to require closer scrutiny. First, opportunities for teacher interactions such as lunch together, coffee gatherings, weekly faculty meetings, and monthly grade level meetings cannot be defined as the sustained colleague interactions that is a prime pre-requisite for the success of this program. More opportunities must exist for faculty team building such as joint committee work, team teaching, and planned discussions which promote active problem solving. Second, the training sessions need to provide more opportunities for teachers to explore many alternatives to use in observations and provide exercises in problem solving activities. Teachers must be trained in ways to give constructive criticism and to engage in problem solving.

Under the current organizational form of most schools, it would be extremely difficult to implement a system of peer supervision model in schools that are cellular and in which teachers carry out their work in isolation (Alfonso, 1977).
Peer supervision implies a degree of openness and trust which exists in too few schools. In the day of the typical teacher, there is little time to reflect on one's own instructional successes and failures, to say nothing of analyzing the work of a peer.

Probably the most serious weakness of peer supervision is that it runs the risk of being random activity, unrelated to other instructional improvement activities and oblivious to the

goals of the organization (Alfonso, 1977). Supervisors are an important link between the teaching system and the goals of the school providing not only interpretation but honest and objective feedback to teachers that can be translated into effective classroom instruction. As a substitute for formal supervision, peer supervision is very ineffective, but as an adjunct to the traditional supervisory approach teachers can develop a strong support group, learn to analyze the teaching process, and, generally, increase their effectiveness in the classroom.

The key to effective peer supervision is to view it as one part of a multilevel supervision program, recognizing the unique contributions that can be made by teachers but also recognizing a need for formal endorsement and support. Peer supervision can make some contributions, but only after those who support its adoption recognize the numerous variables bearing directly on the success of the effort.

Bibliography

Alfonso, R. (1977). Will peer supervision work? Educational Leadership, 34, 594-601.

Cogan, M. (1973). Clinical Supervision. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1985). Peer review in the context of teacher professionalism. A paper prepared for the American Federation of Teachers Executive Council.

Goldhammer, R. (1969). Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Goldsberry, L. (1980). Colleague consultation: supervision augmented. In L. Rubin (ed.) Educational policy; an administrator's overview. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

McFaul, S. & Cooper, J.M. (1983). Peer clinical supervision in an urban elementary school. Journal of Teacher Education. 34, 34-38.

McFaul, S. (1982). A case study of the implementation of peer clinical supervision in an urban elementary school. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Houston.

MOUNTAIN PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

PEER CLINICAL SUPERVISION PROGRAM

I. General Information Session

Definition Peer Clinical Supervision
Brainstorming - Pros and Cons of Peer Supervision
Description of Clinical Supervision Model
Time Commitments

II. Training Sessions

First Training Session

Selecting a Partner
Establishing Criteria
TPAI assessment
Student questionnaire
Self-assessment

Schedule
1 pre-observation conference
3 observations
3 post observation conferences

Second Training Session

Video-tape - Clincial Supervision (ASCD)
Suggested techniques for data gathering
Script Writing
Time Off Task Seating Chart
Teacher Interaction Seating Chart
Time Usage Table

Forms
Pre-observation
Observation
Plan for Professional Development

STUDENTS OFF-TASK SEATING CHART

Teacher Name: _____ Time: _____

Date: _____ Number of Sweeps: _____

Mrs. Smith (front of classroom)			
Flora	Mark	Betty	Joe
Jeff U/I ① U/S ② U/S ⑤ U/Q ⑥	Susan	Robert	Dona
Ursula C/O ⑤ C/S ⑦	Daniel	Ellen	Bill U/I ① U/S ② U/S ④ U/S ⑤
Sharon C/O ⑤ C/S ⑦	Jack C/S ⑥ C/S ⑦	Lee U/I ① C/S ② C/S ⑥ C/S ⑦	Mary

Students' Off-Task Codes

C = Chatting
D = Disruptive
P = Personal Needs
U = Uninvolved
W = Waiting

Time Sweep

① ② ③ ④
⑤ ⑥ ⑦
⑧ ⑨ ⑩

Activity Codes

I = Instruction
O = Organizing
R = Oral Reading
S = Seating
Q = Question/Answer
W = Waiting

Source: Stallings Teaching and Learning Institute

Appendix A

TIME OFF TASK MANUAL

The object of the Time Off Task observation instrument is to record a sample of all students' attending behavior or non-productive use of time during a scheduled reading or math period. The following behaviors are considered Off-Task and On-Task.

Off-Task Behaviors:

C = Chatting	Low talking or whispering, passing notes between students which pulls them off-task
D = Disruptive	Bothering a number of students, e.g., loud talking, throwing things, pushing or fighting
P = Personal Needs	Sharpening pencils, going to the toilet, getting a drink, getting papers or books
W = Waiting	Waiting with hand up for teacher's attention, waiting for materials to be passed

On-Task Behaviors:

* Reading "sanctioned" material
* Playing academic games
* Listening to directions
* Listening to academic content or interactions
* Watching demonstrations related to academic work
* Writing related to academic work
* Reporting, answering or reading aloud
* Performing an academically-related task, e.g., an experiment or project

Activities:

It is also of interest to know what was the expected activity when students were off-task. Were they supposed to be doing seat work (silent reading or written work); listening to the teacher making assignments or organizing (getting papers and books out); listening to the teacher's instructions or explanation; reading aloud; taking part in a question/answer period (children writing math problems on the board is included); or waiting in line for the materials.

S = Seatwork	Student is working at seat on silent reading or written assignment
O = Organizing	Listening to the teacher make assignments or organizing; getting paper and books out
I = Instruction	Listening to the teacher's explanation of content or subject matter
R = Reading Oral	Student is reading aloud
Q = Question/Answer	Teacher poses question to students; includes students writing math problems on the board
W - Waiting	Waiting in line or for materials

Procedures (Code every five minutes)

The observer will need a seating chart with all of the student's names on it. The boxes need to be large enough so that several entries can be made. In the lower grades where students move in and out of groups, it will be necessary to place large name tags on the children if you don't know the children. (Names on two tag boards with yarn going over the shoulders works well.)

Enter the teacher name, date and time on the form. Immediately after the period starts, make a scan or a visual sweep of the room --- going clockwise from the door you entered. Any student who is off task will be shown with one of the following symbols:

C = Chatting
D = Disruptive
P = Personal Needs
U = Uninvolved
W = Waiting

Now make a slash mark and under the slash mark show what the student was supposed to be doing: seatwork, organizing, etc., as listed under activities. Make the marks small enough so that several entries can be made.

Watch the clock and make visual sweeps of the classroom every five minutes until the period ends. Count the total number of sweeps you made and enter that on the form.

On Figure 1, we find that Jeff was uninvolved four out of ten sweeps. This occurred during instruction, seatwork and recitation period. What might be Jeff's problem? Bill was uninvolved during instruction and seatwork. Ursula and Sharon were chatting during organization time and seatwork. In each case, the teacher can make a judgement about what to do to help each child use their time effectively.

A summary of the percent of students off-task can be found by using the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{the sum of the number of students off-task for each observation}}{\text{the number of students} \quad x \quad \text{the number of sweeps}}$$

For example:

In a classroom of 30 students, 10 observations were made. In the first observation, two students were observed to be off-task; in the second observation, four students were off-task; third - three students; fourth = five students; fifth = three students; sixth = one student; seventh = two students; eighth = four students; ninth = seven students; and the tenth time, six students were off-task.

Using these figures, we obtain the following equation:

$$\frac{2 + 4 + 3 + 5 + 3 + 1 + 2 + 4 + 7 + 6}{30 \times 10} = \frac{37}{300} = 12.3$$

Thus, we have found that 12.3% of the students were off-task during this period.

Appendix B

TEACHER'S INTERACTIONS WITH STUDENTS SEATING CHART

DATE: _____ SCHOOL: _____

Mrs. Smith (front of classroom)			
Flora ?G+	Mark ✓✓	Betty	Joe ⓘ +
Jose	Susan ?+, ?G+	Robert ?C	Dona
Ursula —	Daniel	Ellen	Bill —
Sharon —	Jack	Lee —	Mary

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Fill in student's names in appropriate seats. Fill in the dates.
2. Each time the teacher speaks to an individual student, record the appropriate code in the student's box.

CODES:

?	= Asks a direct question	+	= Praises or supports a response
ⓘ	= Asks an open-ended question	C	= Corrects a response
?	= Checks for understanding	G	= Corrects and guides a response
✓	= Makes a comment or response	—	= Reprimands behavior

Source: Stallings Teaching and Learning Institute

TEACHER'S INTERACTIONS WITH STUDENTS
SEATING CHART

This data is to be collected throughout the selected class period.

A simple way to collect information on the teacher's interaction patterns is to record on a seating chart each time the teacher speaks to an individual student. The coding can be as follows:

? = Teacher asks a student a direct question: "Johnny, what is the spelling of the word 'voyage'?"

Ⓠ = Teacher asks student an open-ended, thought-provoking question: "Ursula, what do you think will happen next in this story?"

? = Teacher checks for understanding: "Tell us in your words, Maria, what photo-synthesis means."

✓ = Teacher makes a comment or response: "Flora, you hair looks nice today."

+ = Teacher praises or supports a response: "Very good, Jose, 'forty-two' is the correct answer."

C = Teacher corrects a student's response: "No Barbara, that is wrong;" or "The correct answer should have been 'Mark Twain'."

G = Teacher corrects and guides a response: "Janice, try spelling the word one letter at a time, according to how it sounds, and see if you can figure it out."

– = Teacher reprimands behavior: "Martin, be quiet."

* = Student initiated remarks or questions (NOT in response to teacher's questions)

On the next page, we see an example where the teacher has asked Sue a direct question and has given Bill a reprimand.

These data can help teachers see to whom they are speaking and the nature of the interaction. It will also provide a frequency count of the questions asked, praise given, reprimands, and so forth.

NOTE: If the classroom seating takes a different form than the seating chart, for example, tables are arranged in a horseshoe formation instead of rows of desks, then the seating chart should be redrawn to conform to the actual classroom arrangement. The important thing is to get each student's name in the right place on the seating chart.

Appendix C

OBSERVING IN CLASSROOMS

HOW MUCH TIME DOES IT TAKE?

	Occurs Yes	Occurs No	Time Started	Time Stopped
ORGANIZING				
REVIEW/DISCUSS				
INSTRUCT				
Focus				
Demonstrate				
Examples				
Chalkboard				
CHECK FOR UNDERSTANDING				
SPECIFIC PRAISE				
GUIDING CORRECTION				
Clues				
Restate Question				
Add to Response				
RETEACH				
MONITORING SEATWORK				
WORKS WITH				
Total Group				
Small Group				
Individuals				
SUMMARIZE				
EXPECTATIONS FOR TOMORROW				

Appendix D

Pre-Observation Agreement Form

Pre-Observation Agreement Date:_____

Teacher:_____ Observer:_____

Criteria to be addressed:

Observational focus:

Instruments or techniques to be used to collect data:

Scheduled observation time:

Additional notes:

Appendix E

QUESTIONNAIRE

Background Information

1. Teacher's Name _____
2. Sex _____
3. Age _____
4. Number of years of teaching experience _____
5. Number of years of teaching experience in this district _____
6. Number of years of teaching experience in this school _____
7. Highest academic training completed _____
8. Indicate here the grade level or subject field you currently teach. _____
9. How frequently was your classroom teaching observed by your principal last year?
10. How frequently was your classroom teaching observed by other teachers last year?

Choosing a Partner

11. Your partner's name _____
12. In the selection of your partner, which of the following were significant factors? (check as many as apply)

    (a) Luck of the draw, only one person left

    (b) Random assignment

    (c) Assignment by an administrator

    (d) Assignment by another person

    (e) Friendship

    (f) Similar background or experience in teaching

    (g) Seeking different background or experience in teaching

    (h) Similar philosophy of education

    (i) Seeking different philosophy of education

Teacher's Name _____

(j) Similar subject fields

(k) Seeking different subject fields

(l) Similar skills in teaching

(m) Seeking different skills in teaching

13. Compared to your own image of an excellent teacher, how good do you consider your own teaching performance?

Extremely good	Very good	Moderately good	Slightly good	Not at all good

14. How confident are you that the peer supervision program will help you improve your teaching?

Extremely confident	Very confident	Moderately confident	Slightly confident	Not at all confident

15. How helpful have past formal evaluations been in improving your teaching?

Extremely helpful	Very helpful	Moderately helpful	Slightly helpful	Not at all helpful

16. How helpful have past informal evaluations by other teachers been in improving your teaching?

17. How anxious have you felt during past formal evaluations of your teaching?

Extremely anxious	Very anxious	Moderately anxious	Slightly anxious	Not at all anxious

18. How soundly based were the past formal evaluations of your teaching?

Extremely soundly	Very soundly	Moderately soundly	Slightly soundly	Not at all soundly

19. In general, how often do you informally talk with other teachers about ways of improving teaching?

Never	Few times a year	About once a month	Once a week	Several times a week

20. How similar is your philosophy of teaching to that of your partner?

Extremely similar	Very similar	Moderately similar	Slightly similar	Not at all similar	Don't know

Teacher's Name _____

21. How friendly do you feel toward your partner?

Extremely friendly	Very friendly	Moderately friendly	Slightly friendly	Not at all friendly

22. How anxious do you feel about having your teaching observed by your partner?

Extremely anxious	Very anxious	Moderately anxious	Slightly anxious	Not at all anxious

23. How confident are you that your partner's observations of your teaching will be soundly based?

Extremely confident	Very confident	Moderately confident	Slightly confident	Not at all confident

Appendix F

INTERVIEW

CRITERIA SETTING

1. Name _____ Date _____

2. How did you select the criteria for your observer to use in the observation?

3. How confident are you that you were able to assess your partner's teaching accurately with the criteria you agreed on?

4. How confident are you that your observer was able to assess your teaching accurately with the criteria agreed on?

OBSERVATIONS

5. How relevant to the class session you observed were the criteria you and your partner had selected?

6. How anxious were you while your partner was observing your teaching?

7. How difficult was it for you to evaluate your partner's teaching performance using the criteria you agreed on?

INTERVIEW

CONFERENCES

9. On the average, how long were your conferences?

10. How difficult was it for you to be open and honest with your partner?

11. How difficult do you believe it was for your partner to be open and honest with you?

12. How helpful was your partner's evaluation of your teaching?

13. We asked you to tape record your conferences. How did you feel about that? Did the taping have any impact on the conference? if so, how?

14. In your estimation, what factors contributed to making a "good" conference?

GENERAL

15. Did you discover any teaching patterns that you were not aware of prior to this experience? How hopeful are you that peer supervision will help you to improve your teaching? How will you use what you have learned?

INTERVIEW

16. How likely are you to continue using peer supervision? Why?

17. Would you recommend peer supervision to another team of teachers?

18. Clinical supervision could be done with a supervisor. Would you prefer clinically working with a peer or a supervisor? Why?

19. Have previous supervisory methods affected the success of this program for you?

20. Did you have ample time to conduct your observations and conferences?

21. What have been the most positive aspects of your experience with the peer supervision program?

22. What have been the most negative aspects of your experience with the peer supervision program?